

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA

ESTHER HORSCHEL,)	
)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
DEB HAALAND, Secretary of the Department of the Interior,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>		
ESTHER HORSCHEL,)	
)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
DEB HAALAND, Secretary of the Department of the Interior,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>		

No. 4:18-cv-0006-HRH
[Consolidated with
No. 4:19-cv-0022-HRH]

O R D E R

Joint Discovery Motion¹

Plaintiff and defendant have filed their joint discovery motion with respect to a dispute involving plaintiff Horschel’s fifth set of discovery requests. Appended to the joint motion is correspondence between counsel in which they discuss extensively the factual and legal circumstances giving rise to the instant motion.

¹Docket No. 115.

The parties suggest a telephonic conference. Plaintiff suggests that the court authorize the filing of a discovery motion. In light of the parties' extensive discussion of their dispute in the correspondence appended to the joint motion, neither of the proposed courses of action are necessary.

By minute order of April 5, 2021,² the time for filing the joint motion now before the court was extended to April 7, 2021. The joint motion was timely filed.

Plaintiff's fifth set of discovery requests concerns the decision of the selecting officer Eno-Hendren to hire Hilary Shook as a fire coordinator, a position which required that applicants have 90 days of on-the-line wildland firefighting experience. The material which plaintiff seeks to discover through the instant motion has to do with Shook's wildland firefighting experience in 2006 and earlier. Having produced documents concerning Ms. Shook's wildland firefighting experience as of 2010, defendant contends that the documents now sought are irrelevant. Defendant contends that those documents are irrelevant because Eno-Hendren, as the selecting official, did not make the decision that Ms. Shook had the requisite firefighting experience. That determination was made by human resources employees, who determined that both Ms. Shook and plaintiff were qualified applicants for the fire coordinator position that was filled in 2010.

Having considered the parties' joint motion, and in particular counsel's exchange of correspondence,³ the court concludes that the discovery sought by plaintiff's fifth set of discovery requests is irrelevant as regards the claims made by plaintiff in her fourth amended complaint. The defendant's human resources personnel are not defendants in

²Docket No. 114.

³Docket No. 115-1 to 115-4.

this case. This case is about defendant's 2010 hiring decision, not the 2006 hiring decision.

The motion is denied.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 14th day of April, 2021.

/s/ H. Russel Holland
United States District Judge